The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXIV NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1920 NUMBER 304

Contents

The Week 105

Editorials
- The Prospect of Harding 108
- Half a Loaf and Half a League 110
- The Abdication of the Capitalist 112
- Looting the Dead 114

General Articles
- The Anthracite Vacationists. . Robert W. Bruère 115
- If I were Francesco Guardi (Verse) ..... Amy Lowell 117
- Star-Spangled Men ..... H. L. Mencken 118
- The Long Race (Verse) ..... Edwin Arlington Robinson 120
- British Labor Hesitates ..... G. D. H. Cole 121
- Tammany in Illinois ..... Charles Merz 123

Reviews of Books
- Morale ..... Philonous 126
- Thirty Years Ago ..... E. A. R. 127

The Week

DEMOCRATIC orators are convinced that there is a contradiction between Harding's plan of world organization and Root's plan, as implied in the recently published scheme for a world court. We cannot see any secure proof of such a contradiction. The Root court is additional to the Hague court, but in the spirit of its constitution and the scope of its jurisdiction, it is not very dissimilar. A man without subtlety like Harding might easily take them for the same thing. The Root plan presupposes the existence of the League, but Harding wants some kind of league or association for conference. Under the Root plan certain disputes between members of the League, not referred to the Hague court or to any specially constituted tribunal, must be referred to the World Court. If the one party abstains from the proceedings, the Court may hand down judgment in favor of the other, on a fair prima facie case. Harding wants the Hague Tribunal strengthened; he could hardly refuse to go as far as this. Only justiciable disputes are to be settled by the Root World Court. Harding would probably accept the same limitation. Neither Harding nor Root proposes any machinery for the enforcement of decrees. In an earlier issue we suggested that Harding's plan might be a reflection of what he knew of the forthcoming Root plan. That still looks like a reasonable hypothesis.

IN his letter to President Schurman Harding presents a fairly definite outline of the kind of international organization he would favor. It would be an "association of nations inspired by ideals of justice and fair dealing, rather than of power and self interest. . . . The Hague Tribunal gives us the foundation of such an organization. . . . It is wholly possible to perfect the Tribunal so that its determinations shall be effective and accepted without surrender of national rights." But he recognizes that "the world's peace is now to a great extent intertwined with the settlement of Versailles. From that settlement, I would save all that is good and useful. An association of nations for purposes of conference and a world court with jurisdiction of justiciable questions would, I am confident, now be accepted by all nations." This apparently is all the salvage Harding can find in the League provisions of the Versailles Treaty. What we should like to know is how Harding proposes to get just so much and no more. Is there any conceivable way of doing it through mere ratification with reservations, or must a new conference of the Powers be called to recast all parts of the Treaty that depend in any way on the League? So far as we can see, so radical a departure as Harding's from the point of view of Versailles really demands a new conference.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AT last Cox has begun to give the specifications on which he bases the charge that the Republicans exhibit a deeper dye of reaction than the Democrats. It was the Republicans who defeated the President's plan of curbing the profiteers. That plan, Cox reminds us, included limitations upon the time goods might be kept in cold storage, the marking of the prices at which goods in storage were placed there, and the marking of production prices on all goods entering interstate commerce. Further, corporations engaged in interstate commerce were to be licensed and regulated so as to prevent unconscionable profits. Does Cox believe that those provisions would have been effective? We had a fairly thorough investigation of the production cost of shoes not long ago. Did anyone note a reduction in retail prices after the facts were published? If Cox really wants to count as a progressive he might try to add some teeth to Wilson's good intentions in the profiteering issue. Why not promise to publish the names of corporations and firms whose profiteering is revealed in the excess profits returns? No, some other device must be found, for Cox, in his rage against the profiteers, means to abolish the tax on profiteering, first of all, and with it all reliable information as to its extent.

NOT even Mr. Palmer, we believe, feels very happy over the presence in jail of the 174 persons convicted under the Espionage act. He told Mr. Gompers, petitioning in behalf of organized labor for an amnesty for political prisoners, that he had advocated the repeal of the Espionage act and had seen to it that no prosecutions under its provisions were instituted after the armistice. That was common sense; it would have done no good whatever to prosecute violators after the war was over. But it would be the same kind of common sense to release persons serving sentences under a law no longer worth enforcing. It is not doing the country any good to keep Mr. Debs and the other 173 in jail. "Our courts," says Mr. Palmer, "have sent few persons to prison under the war-time laws who were not guilty. That is what complicates the proposition of a general amnesty." Of course they were guilty "under the war-time laws"; if they were not, it would be Mr. Palmer who ought to plead for amnesty, not the prisoners. Mr. Palmer, however, is not the inventor of this miserable quibble. President Wilson used it before him. To repeal the Espionage act and clear the jails of everybody convicted under it and forget the whole matter, as any other civilized government would do, would seem monstrous to President Wilson. It would seem almost equivalent to a personal inconsistency on his part. Not Palmer but Wilson is the jailor of Debs and the rest of the political prisoners.

THE meaning of the reelection of the five Socialist Assemblymen is clear. The voters will not stand such revolutionary proceedings as the ousting of duly elected representatives belonging to a political party whose tenets the majority does not approve. The Republicans and Democrats joined forces, and if they could have brought out the vote, they could have defeated the Socialists, at least most of them. But they could not get out the vote. Most Democratic and Republican voters remained away from the polls rather than face the alternative of either voting for the Socialists or for Speaker Sweet and the destruction of representative government. The Socialistic vote was light, but sufficient to produce substantial majorities.

BUT the Assembly cared no more for the will of the voters than it cared for the established principles of representative government, the opinions of the most respected and ablest leaders of the state and nation, or even the vital interests of the Republican party to which the Assembly majority avows loyalty. Out with the Socialists, though the skies cave in. Judge Miller is to be commiserated on a party following so disregardful of his wishes and the party's chances. What the Judge could see plainly was that a second ousting of the Socialists would draw to the Republicans not one vote that they do not already hold, and would repel thousands, possibly the thousands that will make up the difference between victory and defeat. Hence, good policy required that the Socialists be permitted to sit, and that consistency be somehow established through cleverly drawn distinctions between the present position of the party and its former position.

ITALIAN workmen will hold a position unique in the history of modern industry if they succeed in imposing upon their employers the terms which, it is reported, Premier Giolitti has accepted as reasonable. According to a dispatch from Lincoln Eyre, to the World, in each plant a committee composed of one worker, one technician and one representative of the clerical or administrative personnel is to be elected and empowered to inquire into every detail of the financial, commercial and technical administration. This committee is to fix wages and familiarize itself with the conditions of cost and selling prices, with the aim of preventing profiteering at the expense of either the laborer or the consumer. It is also to secure for the workers the right of instructing themselves in all technical processes, so that the employer may not monopolize the knowledge necessary to the success of the enterprise. If this is a just view of labor's demands, they involve a complete reversal of the positions of labor and capital. If labor has its way, hereafter

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capital will get what corresponds to a minimum of subsistence and labor will get the rest. But to guard against the danger that labor in one particular branch might reward itself too generously, each industry is subject to supervision through the general confederation of labor.

DAY by day we scan the press eagerly for a note from Secretary Colby telling the Italian workmen just what they can do and what they can't. Unless the Secretary acts quickly there is no telling how far matters may go. Well, perhaps the saving note will appear tomorrow. What it will contain we can guess. First, it will remind the Italian people of our anciently established and recently demonstrated friendship for them. Some statistics of Italian immigration will follow, with allusions to the important part Italians have played in the development of our railways, mines and congested districts. Then will come an authoritative definition of what democracy really means, and a challenge to the workers to submit this industrial dispute to the duly elected representatives of the people, on a protocol acknowledging the full right of the owners of factories to run their properties to suit themselves; we shall then use our good offices to induce them to look with favor on collective bargaining. Finally the Secretary will intimate that if our friendly warning is not heeded, we shall support by every means in our power, short of money, goods, ships and men, any party that opposes them, even if that party holds only the very tiptoe of the boot.

AMERICANS easily drop into the assumption that the League of Nations is practically non-existent on account of America's abstention. But the League gives the best of all proof that it exists in the fact that it works. Just now it is engaged in the great humanitarian work of repatriating war prisoners, of whom nearly a half million are still detained in Germany, Russia, Siberia and Turkestan. Norway, Sweden and Denmark, Holland, Switzerland and Great Britain have granted credits for the work, and France and Italy have provisionally promised to help. The American Red Cross has allotted a million dollars which might be the equivalent of what our government would contribute if we were in the League. A fleet of ships has been chartered by the League, most of them to travel between Germany and Russia in the Baltic, but some of them to go from Hamburg through the Suez Canal to Vladivostok. Some 60,000 prisoners have been repatriated and it is hoped that the repatriation will soon reach 16,000 to 20,000 weekly. It was time. Two years of needless starvation for a half million men is a fair measure of the humanitarian efficiency of modern statecraft.

FINLAND and Sweden have agreed to submit to the League their dispute over the possession of the Aaland Islands. This dispute was not really one that threatened war, because the Finns knew very well that if the matter were to be settled by force, the Swedes would win. For the Swedes are not only vastly superior to the Finns in military and naval power, but hold the great initial advantage that the population of the islands is of Swedish blood and speech and probably favors union with Sweden. These facts the arbitrators selected by the League will doubtless take into account; also the further fact that the islands command the entrance to the Gulf of Bothnia, a waterway of prime importance to Sweden, since the great bulk of Swedish ores are shipped through it, and of relatively minor importance to Finland. On the side of legality neither Finland nor Sweden has a perfectly clear case. The islands once belonged to Sweden, but that was over a century ago. They were attached to Finland under Russian sovereignty, and technically remained with Finland when Russia recognized Finnish independence. But how far that recognition created a legal claim to the islands is uncertain, since the independence of Finland was recognized only by the Soviet government, itself without international recognition. Apparently the League arbitrators will be able to rest their decision on broad grounds of equity and national security.

PRESIDENT DESCHANEL'S resignation placed Premier Millerand in a somewhat difficult position. He had only to give his consent to be elevated to the Presidency of the French Republic. That was to confer upon him great increase in honor, but decrease in power, and Millerand's career impresses the observer as that of a man who loves power and has few illusions. Perhaps it was the expectation of just such a contingency that led Millerand to advocate a constitutional change to endow the Presidency with substantial power. But the change has not come, and Millerand will have to content himself with the role of figurehead. Perhaps that is as well for France. No great progress was making toward European peace under Millerand's direction of French policy. A new premier, not so deeply committed to the last sou and the last possible ton of coal from Germany might move faster toward the reconciliation of Europe, on which French prosperity depends. We do not expect much from any premier supported by a Chamber reflecting the war passions of a day that now seems remote instead of the present-day common sense of the French people. But any step away from Millerand's position would be a step in advance.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Prospect of Harding

EARLY in November a majority of the American voters will probably elect Mr. Warren Harding President of the United States. He has, as the Maine election shows, a better chance of success than the Republican candidate usually has at this stage of the canvass. The calculations of the Republican politicians are being confirmed. As they figured it, the American people were so thoroughly discontented with the Wilson administration that the Republican party could elect practically any candidate whom its leaders pleased to nominate. All the preliminary tests point to the truth of this calculation. What a majority of the American people appear to want more than anything else is a change in government. They propose to get what they want by the usual method of turning out the party in power and of substituting for it the opposing party. They really are not discussing the supposed issues of the campaign or comparing the records and promises of the two candidates. For the most diverse reasons different classes of voters cherish a deep resentment against President Wilson and what he has done. The election in November means to them more than anything else the opportunity of expressing their resentment. After they get Mr. Wilson and his supporters out of the way, they may resume an interest in issues and policies, but until they get him out of the way, nothing else matters.

The classes of Americans who propose first of all to get Mr. Wilson out of the way include not only his Republican opponents and not only citizens of various nationalities, such as the Germans, Irish and Italians who have or think they have a special grievance against him, but a large proportion of the ordinary independent and progressive vote. A fraction of it will, of course, go to Cox on the theory that the election of Cox will make in favor of international order and appeasement, but respectable as are the motives and purposes of these Cox liberals, they are not, so far as we can see, numerous enough to count appreciably in the final result. If Harding is elected, the people who will have decided the result are not former reactionaries but independent liberals or progressives — voters who may have preferred either Wilson or Roosevelt in 1912, and Hughes or Wilson in 1916, but whose choice in any event was dictated by a more or less intelligent wish to alter for the better, rather than to prevent the alteration, of American industrial and political institutions. Progressives no less than non-progressives are possessed by the will to repudiate Wilson and all his ways and supporters. Their resentment is as deep as that of the reactionary Republicans and is expressing itself in a much more indiscriminate and reckless manner.

Inasmuch as the support of former independents and progressives will contribute to the election of Harding, if he is to be elected, it is well for them to consider the consequences of what they are doing. They are positively and deliberately assisting in the election of a President who has incarnated and who continues to incarnate the convictions, the practices and the point of view against which for thirty years progressives and independents have lived by protesting. He is not only a frank reactionary but he is nearly a perfect example of the type. As one speech succeeds another and little by little he turns his mind inside out, the observer of the comedy may well marvel not only that he dares to be so frank but that he is capable of being so complete. He believes devoutly and irresistibly in the principles and practices which prevailed in American politics and business during the period of Republican supremacy from the end of the Civil War until 1900, and he proposes so far as he can to return to them. That at some moment in the history of American progressive democracy, circumstances would favor the nomination and election of a candidate of this kind is nothing strange. What is strange is that the friends and relatives of Theodore Roosevelt should campaign for a candidate who eight years ago used these words about their former leader: "He has convicted himself of insincerity, inconsistency, inconstancy and ingratitude. He has shamed his past and discounted his future. He did all these things under the spur of his blinding egotism and his insatiable lust for power and for the notoriety which he mistakes for fame." What is both strange and unpardonable is that the progressive independent groups in the Republican party should not only submit to such leadership, but should actively make themselves responsible for fastening it on the country.

There is now no doubt at all about Mr. Harding. In spite of his record, there was always a chance that he would develop during the campaign unsuspected possibilities of progressivism—as, for instance, so many Englishmen have done under the pressure of the facts of post-war industrial conditions. But his speeches since his nomination have slammed that door shut. In one respect, indeed, he has improved upon acquaintance. He has taken his job as candidate very seriously and is studiously going through many of the motions of statesmanlike leadership. He has carefully thought out some of his speeches and has exhibited every intention of making them contributions to their subjects. Unfortunately, however, it is when he is most portentous and most thoughtful in his discussion of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public questions that he is most clearly and hopelessly reactionary. From the point of view of a progressive, it makes little difference whether or not he takes himself and his job seriously, and tries to think out a program of legislative action. For excellent as his intentions may be, his mind is incapable of moving except in certain grooves. It is incapable even of conceiving what the motives and purposes are of those who seek to democratize and socialize American political and economic life.

The common object which has united the several phases of the liberal movement in America during the past generation was that of nationalizing the idea of reform. They all sought to stamp on the mind of the American voter some part of a progressive democratic program as the hall-mark of the national ideal. They have all tried to convince public opinion that the fulfillment of the peculiar promise of American life depended not on the preservation intact of existing institutions but upon readjustment of these institutions in the light of a careful study of new social and industrial conditions for the purpose of liberating a large quantity and a higher quality of American manhood and womanhood. At one time under Theodore Roosevelt's leadership it looked as if progressivism had succeeded in establishing itself as the nationalizing force in American public opinion. But if Harding is elected with progressive support, his success will be proof positive of the failure of progressivism to obtain its fundamental objective. For he deliberately disseminates the opposite doctrine—the doctrine that it is conservative adhesion to traditional institutions and practices which serve to nationalize American life by squaring its organization and its behavior with its ideals. He identifies not only the constitution and representative government but the two-party system, the existing privileges and immunities of capital and the existing exploitation of the wage-earner with the fundamental fabric and ideal of the American democracy which profane hands cannot alter without impiety and national disintegration.

If and when he is President he will act upon this doctrine. He will do his best to wrap the flag around the evils and abuses of American politics and business. He will consider any proposal to interfere with the beneficent processes of private business as pernicious "meddling." He will condemn the government regulation of business as "paternalism" and will approve the exploits and immunities of billion dollar corporations as examples of desirable "individualism." He will confuse class privilege with individual opportunity. He will ignore, as the Old Guard has always ignored, the "paternalism" which underlies Republican protectionism, and his "constructive policies will aim at the amplification of special economic privileges rather than their diminution. He proposes, for instance, to do away with the drift to the cities and away from the land not by withdrawing the existing tariff discrimination in favor of urban industry, but by extending the tariff discrimination in favor of agriculture. In his selection of Supreme Court Justices, (the next President will have at least four of them to select) he will appoint lawyers who will strain the words of the Constitution in order to safeguard business against interference from legislatures and from organized labor. His foreign policy will be the creature of this exclusive American protectionism. It will pursue the contradictory policies of promoting the investment of American capital and the extension of American credit abroad and of insisting on the payment of debts by bankrupt or indigent nations while at the same time discriminating against the importation of those commodities in which alone the interest and principle of the debts can be paid. He embodies in this and in all respects the spirit of complacent and aggressive capitalism which he identifies with the traditional spirit of the American democracy.

A large proportion of the people who will vote for Mr. Harding will share his convictions. They will approve, no matter whether he succeeds or fails, his attempt to resurrect in 1920 the Republicanism of the last decades of the nineteenth century and to stamp progressivism as a falsification or a betrayal of the American spirit. They can vote for Harding with a clear conscience. But how sincere progressives can follow the example is beyond our comprehension. By so doing they make themselves positively and personally responsible for the congestion of movement, the eclipse of mind, and the loss of national morale which the reactionism and the aggressive capitalism of Harding must, if progressivism be true, bring upon the country. They cannot plead ignorance, for Harding to his credit has not pretended to be progressive and has candidly expressed the contempt which he feels for political independence and economic liberalism. They cannot plead the lack of an alternative, for it is perfectly possible to cast a purely negative vote for a third candidate which will express more unequivocally anti-Wilson conviction than a vote for Harding can express. The progressive quarrel with Wilson is that the administration by his policy since the armistice has betrayed his liberal ideals and his former liberal supporters. While progressives cannot consistently vote for any candidate who does not repudiate him, neither can they consistently vote for a candidate like Harding who

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

objects more to Wilson's earlier liberalism than to his later betrayal of the liberal cause. A professed progressive who makes himself personally responsible for the election of a frank reactionary in order to express resentment against either Mr. Wilson personally or the Wilson betrayal of progressivism is coming perilously near to converting his progressivism into a joke.

Half a Loaf and Half a League

EVERY so often the current of intelligence gets itself clogged by a metaphor, and there it sticks. A conspicuous obstruction at the moment is the one about half a loaf being better than no bread at all. Now, half a loaf *is* better than no bread at all. But the cool assumption that half of anything at all is better than none of it is one of the curiosities of the human reason. For while there is a good deal to be said for half a loaf there is little to be said for half of an automobile, half of a railroad engine, half of a bridge, half of a steel girder, half of a safe deposit vault, half of a glass jar, half of a pair of trousers, half of a deck of cards, or as King Solomon demonstrated, half of a baby. When the thing you are talking about depends for its usefulness on structure and organization, the metaphor about half being better than none seems not to be of universal scope. For these cases proverbial wisdom provides another metaphor: it says that a miss is as good as a mile.

Now whether the League falls under the rubric of half a loaf or missed by a mile depends a good deal on the facts you choose to look at. You can think of that earnest and industrious Secretariat at 117, Piccadilly, London, registering treaties, or at least some of them, trying to straighten out passport troubles, adjusting a dispute in the Baltic, looking into the "White Slave" traffic, coordinating international bureaus, concerning itself with stranded prisoners of war, preparing to consider the methods of disarmament, the terms of mandates, and no end of other interesting and important tasks. If you think of these activities on their merits, you cannot help believing that the Secretariat is a most useful affair, excellently conducted by Sir Eric Drummond and his colleagues. You will feel that in the Secretariat there is something to rejoice over and to cherish. For here is a centre of organized political intelligence, a conscious effort to establish an international organ of communication.

Then suddenly you fix your mind on a totally different set of facts: on Syria and Mesopotamia, where France and Britain are engaged rather violently in convincing their Allies the Arabs how necessary is a mandate, on Siberia where the writs of the Covenant do not seem to run as against Japan, on the Russo-Polish war, the Polish-Lithuanian war, all somehow unrelated to the League for preventing war, all of them wars to be sure involving battle, murder and sudden death, but not wars in the specific, exact, precise and absolute sense envisaged by the Covenant of the League of Nations.

As you search for the League of Nations outside the literature which comes from 117, Piccadilly, you soon discover that the governing body in international affairs is not the Council of the League, but the Supreme Council of France, Brittain and, by courtesy, Italy. "Why is it?" asks the Round Table in an article presumably not distasteful to the Prime Minister's official family—"Why is it that the Supreme Council continues to function while the League of Nations appears to languish?" Because America is outside, says the New York Evening Post. The Round Table takes another line.

> At Spa Europe was in reach of a general conflagration. . . . If timely agreement at Spa were possible, it was mainly because England was ready to act for herself if agreement was blocked. The Supreme Council is a conference, pure and simple, unhampered by any provisions that nothing can be done unless all its members agree to the doing of it. . . . A World Council in which no one can act unless it is unanimous will perish quickly or prepare the way to infinite calamity.

The article goes on to point out that the League is simply incapable of dealing with Russia when one statesman, Millerand, is committed to non-intercourse. Millerand can absolutely block action on Russia in the Council of the League. But in the Supreme Council, if agreement is found impossible, then everyone is free to act as he will. You can thus arrive at some positive action in the Supreme Council, but in the Council of the League, everyone has a veto on all the voters.

Finally the Round Table points out that no conference can be effective which does not include all the great Powers—which does not include Germany and Russia. Yet the obstacles to admitting Germany and Russia to the League, and especially to the Council of the League, are virtually insuperable. Ten or twelve votes can exclude from membership in the League; France and the United States can indefinitely prevent either Power from joining the Council.

> Now compare with all this the working of the Supreme Council unfettered by the terms of a constitution. In response to the needs of the situation Germany

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was admitted to conference at Spa. The Ministers of England, France, Italy and Belgium then began the difficult task of transacting world affairs in personal discussion with German ministers.

Since this article in the Round Table was written affairs have taken a turn which suggests that the analysis does not go deep enough. The French, assisted by Mr. Wilson, have succeeded in obstructing the progress of peace with Russia, and in rejecting the method of Spa and San Remo by insisting, again with American help, that reparation shall be dealt with not by conference as at Spa, but by the rigid and autocratic Reparation Commission sitting at Paris.

The real issue in Europe, as we see it, is not between the League and the Supreme Council, but between the dictatorship of the victors and a concert of the Powers. France, which is the frank exponent of the dictatorship, furnishes the clue. When the League threatens to become an organ representative of Europe and the world, France and her satellites reject the League, as they do in Poland and Asia Minor, in favor of the Supreme Council. When the Supreme Council threatens to become an organ of conciliation, as it promised to become at San Remo and Spa, France pulls away from the Supreme Council, and turns to the Reparation Commission, to secret bargains, as at Aix, and secret conventions, as with Belgium. France consistently seeks the substance, not the form, and pursues it through all the various international agencies by which Europe is governed. Supreme Council, Council of the League, Plenary Council, Reparation Commission—these are merely the tools to be picked up and discarded as they help or hinder the continental dictatorship of France. The purpose in every case is to impose by fiat the French will upon Central and Eastern Europe.

Now this condition of affairs obviously does not arise out of the text of the Covenant. It has nothing to do with the Court, or the Secretariat, or even Article Ten. It arises out of the settlement of the war. We are aware that the funny man on the New York Evening Post thinks it funny that some of the weeklies regard the present condition of Europe as related to the settlement at Versailles. Nevertheless it is related. And what was done and not done at Paris is the direct cause, not of the Italian earthquakes, to be sure, but of the swamps of misery through which Europe struggles to her recovery. The settlement of Paris initiated the practice which fully explains the troubles of the League. The Peace Conference dictated peace without discussion, and denied Central Europe and Russia the right to confer. It established Garyism in diplomacy, and sanctioned it; not only sanctioned it, but hallowed it with the Wilson idealism. The Peace Conference said in effect that the way to make the world safe for democracy was to outlaw mankind from the Rhine to the Pacific, a few small nationalities excepted. Now if that was the right way to make peace, if that is what disinterested people accepted as the climax of a crusade for democracy, who can blame France if she proceeds to enforce that peace by exactly the same method as was used to frame it? If without conference the supposedly permanent charter of a fundamental law could be devised, why have a conference over the details?

By the standards of the Peace Conference France is morally right. It is England and Italy who are welching. France is loyal not only to the letter but to the inner spirit of the Treaty of Versailles, and the others are disloyal. To be sure, the loyalty of France is sustained by dreams of reparations and visions of power, which both England and Italy do not find for themselves within the terms of the Treaty. That is not the point. The point is that the Treaty of Versailles, framed by the victors, is the charter of French policy, and no one can seriously object to French policy who does not seriously attack the Treaty on which it rests. The League is utterly incapable of revising the Treaty, because the "heart" of the Treaty — the Reparations and Reprisal, is specifically excluded from the jurisdiction of the League. It is true today, as the New Republic asserted that it was in May of 1919, that the character of the settlement dominates and stifles the League. The idea that joining the League and sending Ambassador Wallace to its occasional meetings will alter any of this fundamentally, is amiable partisanship, but not serious politics.

The only thing which will extricate the League from the settlement under which it lies buried is a radical revision of that settlement. The acid test of revision is the readmission of Germany and Russia under governments of their own choosing to the councils of Europe. These councils can be called by any name you choose, so long as they are conferences at which the decisions of Europe are taken. Such conferences, simple as the words sound, will be resisted to the very end. They cannot come into being until the Treaty of Versailles in all its basic ideas is discarded, for a Europe organized under that Treaty cannot for at least two generations return to conference. But when such a conference occurs, the substance of a League of Nations will exist. Until it does occur, with all that would have to precede its occurrence, until that time, the League, in spite of minor good features, is bound to remain a sideshow.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Abdication of the Capitalist

ECONOMIC revolution is no doubt involved in the demands of the Italian workers for participation in the control and profits of industry. The same revolutionary idea found expression in the votes of the International Miners' Congress at Geneva. It is implicit in much of the thinking of the leaders of British labor, and even in this country, usually considered a generation behind in all that pertains to industrial relations, we encounter this revolutionary idea in one unexpected quarter after another. Yet it creates very little commotion even in the breasts of those who are by temperament and conviction the partisans of things as they are. How can that be? Do they not realize what is going on, or does their intuition tell them that the impending revolution, if it is realized, will not change the face of things so very radically? The latter may appear an absurd supposition to some, but not to those who bear in mind the analogies of political revolution. In almost every case there has been after the revolution a settling back to what looked so much like the antecedent condition as bitterly to disillusion all those who had dreamed of a new heaven and a new earth. Revolution is a process involving time. Much of the progress goes on silently before the crisis it generates, more or less accidental as to time and character, and much of it continues silently after the crisis has been passed.

In the present revolutionary crisis the capitalist is summoned formally to abdicate his control over industry. But how significant is that control, as matters stand? Has the capitalist not already abdicated much of his power, as the British sovereign abdicated his power when once he admitted the Commons' right to control finance? To be sure the capitalist has not abdicated any part of his powers in favor of the mass of his employees. Neither did the British sovereign abdicate his power over the purse in favor of the mass of the people. Financial control devolved at first upon a minority whose position in the community seemed to fit them peculiarly for its exercise. Nobody dreamed at the time that no logical point of rest could be found short of universal participation in the control of government.

The capitalist, without really knowing it, has been engaged in a process of abdication extending as far back as the organization of the first joint stock company or corporation with securities of varying privileges. What control do the holders of bonds in a modern railway corporation exercise? They have no voice whatever in determining railway tariffs or rates of wages. They have abdicated their powers completely in favor of the stockholders, who are supposed to be a class peculiarly qualified to make practical judgments, because their incomes fluctuate with the prosperity or lack of prosperity of the enterprise. True, if the enterprise fails so completely as to default on interest, legal control returns to the bondholders, but how? Through a receiver, a public officer, who represents not the will but the interests of the bondholders, as a guardian represents the interests of a minor or an incompetent whose will and right of control have no standing before the law.

But among the stockholders themselves, the more substantial, the group that may most properly be regarded as capitalists, the holders of preference shares, have abdicated much of their power, frequently practically all of it, in favor of the holders of common stock, again regarded as a peculiarly qualified class, since their interests are still more closely bound up with success or failure. On the day when this was written Wheeling and Lake Erie preferred was worth 24½ while common stock was worth 12¾. Western Pacific preferred was worth 67½, and common 30½. Denver and Rio Grande preferred was worth 11¾, common 5½. In these instances about twice as much power of control goes with a hundred dollars invested in common stock. They are not extreme instances, even in the more solid properties traded in on the New York Stock Exchange. We may cite the Robt. Reis Co. preferred, 70¼, common 10¼, or American Hide and Leather, preferred 69½, common 12⅜. Very solid companies showing large profits do indeed often exhibit the phenomenon of common stock worth more than preferred. But no one, we believe, would deny that the rule runs the other way, and that a disproportionate power of control falls to the holders of the securities showing the widest variation in possible income.

That is not all. As soon as a variety of common stock gains a reputation for solidity, it becomes an investment security and tends to distribute itself widely among small capitalists who have neither the time nor the qualifications for really discretionary participation in control. They are disfranchised in fact though not in name. They may in most instances vote by proxy, but the best they can do with their proxies, as a rule, is to place them in trust with some official or financier whose great interests in the property appear to make him a safe repository of power. We have been informed by a man whose financial experience lends great au-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thority to his statements that a simple provision of law nationalizing corporation proxies would necessarily give the government majority control in practically every important corporation in the country. No need, then, for governmental purchase of securities at all, if we wish to nationalize our industry! The government has only to assume the powers abdicated by the owners of capital and floating around for private financiers to employ in the advancement of their own policies.

We will not linger over a plan of nationalization that looks so simple and logical that it must somehow be fallacious. We have advanced it merely as indicating the probable extent in which capital has abdicated its power of control. That abdication would be sufficiently advanced for the purposes of our argument even if every holder of stock were in a position to exercise all the powers he nominally possesses. The Railway Age, in a sermon on thrift addressed to railway labor, recently pointed out how easy it would be for them to save up money enough to gain complete control of our railway system. That system, officially estimated at a capital value of eighteen billions, in round numbers, is controlled by stocks of a par value of $6,583,000,000, and a market value, according to the Railway Age rough estimate, of $3,851,000,000. One half of that, or less than two billions, would give absolute control of every item of railway policy not now exercised by the state. One dollar out of every nine invested would suffice. If railway labor would save up its recent increases in pay, in three years it would be in a position to take over the system. There would be no need for labor to make the concessions offered by the Plumb plan to capital and to the public. It could enjoy the unabated privilege of ruling held by the supposedly qualified group of officers, investors and speculators now in charge of the railways.

Of course if the railway laborers actually gave sign of reaching for control in this manner, some group who already had two billions would rush in ahead of them. But all such considerations are beside the point, which is that capital as such has abdicated its control in favor of a special class, capitalistic in origin and instinct, to be sure, but deriving its qualifications for the trust reposed in it not from the fact of ownership, but from the fact of a supposedly immediate dependence upon the good or ill fortune of the business. The common stock holders, it is assumed, must, in looking out for their own interests look out for those of the preferred stockholders and bondholders as well. Bad management will hit the common stockholders first of all. Therefore they may be expected to do everything that can be done to insure success.

The logic of this concentration of power in the hands of the active minority is sound so far as it goes, even though the power may be and in fact frequently is abused in the course of stock-jobbing intrigues. But does the logic go far enough? There are other interests besides those of capital intimately bound up with the success of the enterprise. Labor may, indeed, be assured a given scale of pay, if it is employed at all, but whether employment shall be general or slack depends on the success of the enterprise. The controlling capital group may deliberately reduce or discontinue service, or it may exert all its energy and intelligence to ensure success. Similar alternatives present themselves to labor. The guarantee against sulking and sabotage on the part of the capital group lies in the identification of its fortunes with those of the enterprise. Can anyone who has listened to the complaints of employers through the months since the armistice doubt that a similar identification of the fortunes of labor with those of the enterprise would be desirable, if in any way feasible?

But there is already such an identification of fortune, it may be asserted. When the enterprise thrives, employment is good; when it fails, employment disappears. That is true at the limits, but the practical question is, how true is it in the general case, which lies between unequivocal success and complete failure? There the identification of the interest of labor with that of the enterprise may logically exist, but it is not felt. It never will be felt until labor really participates in the control, and in the profits of success.

That appears to be all that is sought in the present so-called revolutionary demands of labor. They are not directed against the interests of the capital that has already abdicated its control, the eight dollars out of the nine. They are aimed at the ninth dollar and not in its quality as capital seeking normal income, but in its quality of control of the enterprise. Those demands, we believe, will have to be granted sooner or later. When capital began to divide itself into categories of which some should have no part in control, others a modest part, and still others all but complete control, it was already foreordained that control would drift away from capital as such. For a brief time control might rest on the fringe of speculative capital, but that could not be a permanent resting place. The time was certain to come when all those whose good will was essential to the success of the enterprise would have to be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vested with a share in its control. That time is apparently approaching. Those who do not admit development into the premises of their social philosophy are bewildered and cry revolution. But most men realize that what is coming, though different from what has gone before, is not so different that life will not be able, with scarcely perceptible adjustments, to go on as before.

Looting the Dead

A HORRIBLE crime has been committed, by whom, for what purpose, whether by deliberate intent or by vicious negligence, nobody yet knows. Some thirty-four persons have been killed and hundreds injured, not merely innocent persons, but persons against whom not even a criminal madman could have borne a grudge. Do we have at large a madman or a group of mad conspirators who aim at the destruction of life wantonly and to no other immediate purpose than the exhibition of maleficent power? That is a terrifying possibility. New York will not rest easy until the police have unravelled the mystery of the Wall Street explosion.

While the public stands aghast, stupefied by the shock, busy gentlemen of ghoulish disposition slip about trying to pick a little profit for themselves out of the disaster. The dead are dead; there must be some loot lying about. The Tribune, as one might have expected, loots the dead for a moral. "Candidates for office, even for the highest, spread the doctrine that when there is discontent it is the government's fault, and that a corrupt conspiracy exists to gain control of bayonets to oppress the masses." (That of course means Cox.)

"The Bolshevist-minded, including both parlor and non-parlor varieties, insidiously inculcate the idea that the majority has no right to govern and excuse the minorities which have set out to rule by violence. Political organizations and their spokesmen steadily distil the poison of the so-called class war; leave nothing undone to arouse ignorant passion and to stimulate suspicion, envy and hatred. What has happened is a natural consequence."

We felicitate the Tribune on its loot. There are holes in it and it is rather dirty. But it is no doubt worth what it cost the Tribune.

Close behind the Tribune, in its search for loot, comes the Department of Justice. "It is likely that Mr. Palmer will ask Congress, indirectly if not directly, to check the powers of the Bureau of Immigration of the Department of Labor. After the Department of Justice had recommended hundreds of aliens caught in the net last year for deportation, the Bureau of Immigration, through Louis Post, refused to send these persons out of the country." Such are the pickings exhibited by the Department to the correspondent of the Times. They may serve to wipe some of the grosser stains off the record of the Department.

Next comes Edward H. Moore, Democratic National Committeeman, with the discovery that the Republicans are in some sense responsible. "I hope that the Republican leaders will take a lesson from the dastardly act in New York to cease appealing to every radical element of discontent in the country in their frantic attempt to secure the election of Senator Harding by any means, no matter how vicious."

We suggest that hereafter Mr. Moore and the Tribune be paired when issues of the kind arise. Neither will then need to say anything and the world will be the wiser.

It may be said that such stupidities, while of course they do no good, cannot do any harm. That is not so certain. They egg the police on to arrest all manner of persons against whom charges of radicalism may be brought, while the evidence as to the real perpetrators of the crime disappears. The police will not avail themselves of the insinuations of Mr. Moore and the Tribune to invade the liberty of Harding and Cox, but they might easily be led to harry a great many citizens whose liberty is just as dear in the eyes of the law and whose complicity is not a bit more demonstrable. The police have a desperately hard task before them. They have to try to make progress toward the clearing up of the crime, and they have to keep the public assured that they are making progress even while they grope among opaque uncertainties. If they exhibit moderation and good sense in their handling of miscellaneous suspects, that will not fall to the credit of the Tribune and its kind.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1920, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY — CHARLES MERZ
FRANCIS HACKETT — WALTER LIPPMANN
ALVIN JOHNSON — PHILIP LITTELL
SIGNE TOKSVIG, Assistant Editor

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS, CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE; REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Anthracite Vacationists

ON May 21st, when the anthracite operators and miners were at the parting of the ways, President Wilson sent their joint wage scale committee a telegram in which he said: "I shall insist that the matters in dispute be submitted to the determination of a commission to be appointed by me." This Commission met in Washington on Monday, the 21st of June, 1920, organized and proceeded to Scranton, Pa., to take testimony. On August 30th, President Wilson accepted the award as drafted by William O. Thompson, chairman, and William L. Connell representing the operators, and rejected the dissenting minority report by Neal J. Ferry, representing the miners. Immediately after the President's acceptance of the majority report, the official representative of the United Mine Workers in the anthracite region while endorsing Mr. Ferry's dissent also endorsed his pledge that "fully conscious of our obligation of honor and good faith, we will, of course, accept and carry out this majority award in the anthracite mines with the most scrupulous care. . . . All of our energies and authority without reservation will be devoted to this end."

Notwithstanding this pledge, the rank and file, especially in the highly unionized districts, immediately proceeded to "take a vacation." Commenting upon the irregularity, Mr. E. E. Loomis, president of the Lehigh Valley Coal Company, speaking for the operators, said in a statement published on Friday, September 10th: "This action emphasizes the futility of collective bargaining with unions. . . . It is one more demonstration. . . . of labor not making contracts in good faith and of leaders who do not lead, but trail."

On the main issue the situation is clear: the miners have broken their pledge. On this point there is and can be no debate. To leap to the conclusion, however, as Mr. Loomis does, that this incident "emphasizes the futility of collective bargaining with unions," or as President Wilson does when, refusing to reopen the award, he places the anthracite miners in the same category with the late German Kaiser and the present Russian government, is to indulge in harmful sensationalism.

The risk of error in such sweeping indictments, is illustrated in the President's letter of September 10th when he calls the miners' attention to the telegram he sent to Enoch Williams in reply to a telegram from Williams threatening a general strike unless the majority award of the Commission were set aside. In that telegram the President said: "If your communication declaring your intention of refraining from work unless I set aside the award of the Anthracite Commission on or before September 1st, is intended as a threat, you can rest assured that your challenge will be accepted. . . ." Williams' telegram thus becomes the target of the President's wrath. But who is Enoch Williams? A duly elected official of the United Mine Workers? An authorized spokesman of the men who through their representatives became parties to the agreement creating the Anthracite Commission? Not at all. So far as the United Mine Workers are concerned, Williams has no more authority to speak than any one of the one hundred and fifty odd thousand men in the anthracite field.

There are three great trade union districts in the anthracite region: District No. 1, centering at Scranton; District No. 7, centering at Hazleton; District No. 9, centering at Shamokin. District No. 7 is completely unionized. In District No. 9 from 80-90 per cent of the men belong to the United Mine Workers. District No. 1 is the weak link in the anthracite organization; there the United Mine Workers have never claimed more than 40 per cent of the men. This district is closest to Ellis Island; it is therefore most seriously affected by recurrent waves of immigration. Moreover, for years it has been the centre of feud among the trade union leaders themselves. Until a fortnight ago its president was Mr. John T. Dempsey, ex officio a member of the scale committee that argued the miners' case before the Commission. But throughout the summer, Enoch Williams, his rival in the last district presidential campaign, has contested his election. Soon after the Commission's award was announced, Dempsey was deposed. His hold on the district had been weakening steadily during a number of years; Williams' following grew as Dempsey's fell away. In the early stages of the Commission's work in Scranton there was an apparently spontaneous strike in Pittston, a part of District No. 1, of some 10,000 miners who alleged that the local officials of the United Mine Workers, headed by Dempsey, had neglected their grievances. Enoch Williams, though a seasoned member of the United Mine Workers, joined the "outlaws" as a member of their strike committee. It was solely by virtue of this "outlaw" authority that Williams sent his threatening telegram to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President at the very time when the authorized representatives of the United Mine Workers publicly pledged their energies to the execution of the majority award. In spite of these important facts, the President bases his sweeping imputation of Kaiserism upon the indiscreet utterance of Enoch Williams.

Similarly, the President of the Lehigh Valley Coal Company beclouds important considerations. Does the present action of the "vacationists," most of whom are indeed in the trade union strongholds, "emphasize the futility of collective bargaining with trade unions"? What are the facts?

The anthracite operators maintain a Bureau of Information. Last November the director of this Bureau, Mr. E. W. Parker, addressed the American Mining Congress in St. Louis. His speech glorified the work of the Anthracite Coal Strike Commission created by President Roosevelt in 1902. "In the seventeen years," said Mr. Parker, "from Thursday morning, October 23rd, 1902, when the anthracite miners returned to their working places, to the present time, there has been no general strike in the anthracite region. . . The Board of Conciliation, without intending possibly to do so, carries out the Biblical injunction 'come let us reason together,' and by its seventeen years of usefulness has provided a time-tested method of procedure and of efficiency in handling labor disputes that may well be taken as an example for other lines of industry."

On the side of the miners, this Board of Conciliation has been financed and conducted by the very men whom the President now classes with the late Kaiser. There can indeed be no debate on the question as to whether the "vacationists" have violated their agreement; but in the face of this seventeen years' record, is it not reasonable to assume there must be extenuating circumstances?

After repeated excursions through the anthracite region, I find the following grievances uppermost in the minds of the "vacationists":

1. They bitterly resent the policy of the government which has kept them under the wartime restraints of the Lever act while withdrawing all such restraints from the alleged profiteering of the operators. This bitterness was intensified when the Chairman of the Commission ruled that "the seven exhibits (presented by the miners) purporting to set out the relation between wages and wholesale and retail prices, the situation as to freight rates, the operation and financing of anthracite railroads and other exhibits are not germane to the matters in dispute." That these exhibits were germane, the miners contend, is now fully demonstrated by the language of the majority report itself, in the introduction to which the Chairman, supported by the operators' representative, declares: "The public interest in the award centres chiefly around the wages determined upon and the effect of these wages upon prices. . . . This award while providing improved conditions for the employees offers no justification for any advance in the retail price of coal, but on the other hand is consistent with a decline in prices."

Moreover, the miners believe that if they had been free from the unequal restraints of the Lever act, as the result of which many of their national officials are now under indictment for attempting a strike in the bituminous fields, they would have been able to secure a satisfactory agreement with the operators with whom they had had amicable and satisfactory dealings for seventeen years, either through the ordinary processes of negotiation or through a legitimate strike. It was under protest that they finally became parties to the agreement creating the Commission. Their wartime agreement with the operators terminated on March 31st, 1920. Up to that date, negotiations directed to the formulation of a new agreement had failed. Instead of striking on the first of April, however, on the intervention of Secretary Wilson, they decided to keep at work. The compromise proposed by the Secretary of Labor they rejected as unsatisfactory. Immediately thereafter President Wilson served notice that "I shall insist that the matters in dispute be submitted to the chairman of a commission to be appointed by me." They disliked the President's "I shall insist" especially when they contrasted it with President Roosevelt's "I now most earnestly ask and urge that the miners accept this commission" in his telegram of October 16th, 1902, to Mr. John Mitchell, then president of the United Mine Workers of America. They were not willing, however, to involve more of their officers in the toils of the Lever act. On May 27th, 1920, in convention at Wilkes-Barre, they resolved to accept the "offer of the President of the United States" after their scale committee had submitted "the following as the facts which *compel* this convention to accept the proposal of the President. . . . This convention realizes that through industrial legislation, such as the court's interpretation of the Lever act, the abuse of the writ of injunction with the tie-up of union funds and other oppressive measures, makes it almost humanly impossible to wage a successful battle. . . . We are *forced* to accept the only alternative, namely, the commission."

The "vacationists" feel that they entered the agreement, now repudiated, under duress.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

2. The miners feel that the basis of the wage and hour scale established by the new award "is equivalent to penalizing the employees for their patriotic services during the war and during the uncertain days following the Armistice. . . . What it does is to fix hourly rates which will provide a minimum of approximately $1,400 provided the employees work the *same hours as they did in 1919*. . . . The miners, when they came into the present arbitration, believed that the 8-hour day was now an established feature of the industry . . . . The thought never even occurred to them that this commission might seek to violate old agreements . . . . not submitted to them for arbitration." During the war the working force in the anthracite region was greatly depleted; yet the miners who remained, by working, as they say, day and night, Saturdays and holidays, got out during the years 1917 and 1918 the greatest anthracite tonnage in history. For this extraordinary effort they were paid a moderate wartime bonus; their total annual earnings, made under pressure which they contend it is humanly impossible for them longer to sustain, are now made the basis of the new award.

Moreover, they felt that the time had come in the anthracite region when wages should be determined on the principle of the Living Wage. In their arguments before the Commission they contended strongly for this principle and made the standards promulgated by the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics the principal basis of their demands. Early in 1920 the Bureau of Labor Statistics had in behalf of the Bituminous Coal Commission made an effort to determine the minimum necessary to maintain a family of five in health nd decency in various coal mining communities, cluding communities in Pennsylvania. The Bu- au fixed this minimum at slightly above $2,000. e Chairman of the Commission, Dr. W. O. ompson, is President of Ohio State University. When the operators protested the findings of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics as inapplicable to the anthracite region, the Chairman instructed Professor M. W. Hammond of his own university to make a fresh analysis of the cost of living in the anthracite field. Professor Hammond in a carefully detailed report decided that $1,600 was the minimum upon which any worker in the anthracite field could be expected to maintain a family in health and decency. The miners immediately withdrew their own figures and accepted Professor Hammond's. The Commission, however, rejected the findings of its own expert and fixed $4.20 per day as the minimum per diem, which on the basis of a working year of 273 days, the highest figure advanced by the operators, would provide annual earnings of $1,147. The failure of the Commission explicitly to adopt the principle of the living wage, the miners assert is a gross miscarriage of justice.

3. The miners contend that the scale adopted by the Commission falls short of the scale awarded by the President's Bituminous Coal Commission. In spite of this fact they point out that the "President of the United States directed a meeting of the representatives of the United Mine Workers of America and the representatives of the various coal operators' associations comprising the central competitive fields, to be held for the purposes of remedying the existing inequality of the award of the Bituminous Coal Commission." They based their request for a reconsideration of the award "not only upon the belief that the award is inadequate but also in view of what has transpired recently in the bituminous coal mining industry." They believed that the President, when this fact was brought to his attention, would follow the precedent which he had already established. By disregarding their petition and centering his attack upon the unauthorized threat of Enoch Williams, the President has aroused among them a spirit which is far from conciliatory.

These are only a few of the major grievances alleged by the "vacationists." To the outsider, with his mind focussed on coal and general principles, they do not justify the breaking of an agreement, whether made under duress or not. As extenuating circumstances, however, they do have weight. They counsel a temperate and conciliatory spirit. To set these men down as upstart Kaisers in the face of their seventeen years' record is not likely to improve their manners. One need not go overseas to find an explanation of their present state of mind; it is the direct product of government by injunction.

ROBERT W. BRUÈRE.

September 16th.

If I Were Francesco Guardi

I think you are a white clematis
Climbing the wall of a seaside garden,
When there is a green haze on the water
And a boy is eating a melon in a boat with a brown sail.

I think you are the silver heart of a great square,
Holding little people like glass beads,
Watching them parade—parade—and gather,
When the sun slips to an opposite angle,
And a thunder of church bells lies like a bronze roof
below the sky.

AMY LOWELL.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Star-Spangled Men

I.

I OPEN the memoirs of General Grant, Volume II, at the place where he is describing the surrender of General Lee, and find the following:

> I was without a sword, as I usually was when on horseback on (sic) the field, and wore a soldier's blouse for a coat, with the shoulder straps of my rank to indicate to the army who I was.

Anno, 1865. I look out of my window and observe an officer of the United States Army passing down the street. Anno, 1920. Like General Grant, he is without a sword. Like General Grant, he wears a sort of soldier's blouse for a coat. Like General Grant, he employs shoulder straps to indicate to the army who he is. But there is something more. On the left breast of this officer, apparently a major, there blazes so brilliant a mass of color that, as the sun strikes it and the flash bangs my eyes, I wink, catch my breath and sneeze. There are two long strips, each starting at the sternum and disappearing into the shadows of the axillia—every hue in the rainbow, the spectroscope, the kaleidoscope — imperial purples, sforzando reds, wild Irish greens, romantic blues, loud yellows and oranges, rich maroons, sentimental pinks, all the half-tones from ultra-violet to infra-red, all the vibrations from the impalpable to the unendurable. A gallant Soldat, indeed! How he would shame a circus ticket-wagon, a Bakst drop-curtain, if he wore all the medals and badges, the stars and crosses, the pendants and lavallières, that go with those ribbons! . . . I glance at his sleeves. Two simple golden stripes on the one—twelve months beyond the raging main. None on the other—the Kaiser's cannon missed him. . . .

II.

What all these ribbons may signify I am sure I don't know; probably they belong to campaign medals and tell the tale of innumerable and inordinate butcheries in foreign parts—of Filipinos, Mexicans, Haitians, Dominicans, perhaps even Prussians. But in addition to campaign medals and the Distinguished Service Medal there are now certainly enough foreign orders in the United States to give a distinct brilliance to the national scene, viewed, say, from Mars. The Frederician tradition, borrowed by the ragged Continentals and embodied in Article I, Section 9, of the Constitution, lasted until 1918, and then suddenly blew up; to mention it today is a sort of indecorum, and tomorrow, no doubt, will be a species of treason. Down with Frederick; up with John Philip Sousa! Imagine what General Pershing would look like at a state banquet of his American favorite order, the Benevolent and Protective one of Elks, in all the Byzantine splendor of his casket of ribbons, badges, stars, garters, sunbursts and cockades—the lordly Bath of the grateful homeland, with its somewhat disconcerting "Ich dien"; the gorgeous tricolor baldrics, sashes and festoons of the Légion d'Honneur; the grand cross of SS. Maurizio e Lazzaro of Italy; the sinister Danilo of Montenegro, with its cabalistic monogram of Danilo I and its sinister hieroglyphics; the breastplate of the Paulownia of Japan, with its rising sun of thirty-two white rays, its blood-red heart, its background of green leaves and its white ribbon edged with red; the mystical St. Saviour of Greece, with its Greek motto and its brilliantly enamelled figure of Christ; above all, the Croix de Guerre of Czecho-Slovakia, a new one and hence not listed in the books, but surely no shrinking violet! Alas, Pershing was on the wrong side—that is, for one with a fancy for gauds of that sort. The most blinding of all known orders is the Medijie of Turkey, which not only entitles the holder to his pick of four wives, but also absolutely requires him to wear a red fez and a frozen star covering his whole façade. I was offered this order by Turkish spies during the war, and it wabbled me a good deal. The Alexander of Bulgaria is almost as seductive. The badge consists of an eight-pointed white cross, with crossed swords between the arms and a red Bulgarian lion over the swords. The motto is "Za Chrabrost!" Then there are the Prussian orders—the Red and Black Eagles, the Pour le Mérite, the Prussian Crown, the Hohenzollern and the rest. And the Golden Fleece of Austria—perhaps the noblest of them all. Think of the Golden Fleece on a man born in Linn County, Missouri! . . . I begin to doubt that the General would have got it, even supposing him to have taken the other side. The Japs, I note, gave him only the grand cordon of the Paulownia, and the Belgians and Montenegrins were similarly cautious. There are higher classes. The highest of the Paulownia is only for princes, which is to say, only for non-Missourians. . . .

Pershing is the champion, with General March a bad second. March is a K.C.M.G., and entitled to wear a large cross of white enamel bearing a lithograph of the Archangel Michael and the motto, "Auspicium Melioris Aevi," but he is not a K.C.B. Admirals Benson and Sims are also grand crosses of Michael and George, and like most other respectable Americans, members of the Legion of Honor, but they seem to have been forgotten by the Greeks, the Montenegrins, the Ital-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ians and the Belgians. The waspish Sims appears to cherish obsolete constitutional prejudices; he has even refused the D.S.M. It would be hard to think of any other American who would refuse it, or, failing it, the grand decoration of chivalry of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows. It was by way of the Odd Fellows, I suspect, that the lust to glitter and jingle got into the arteries of Americanos. For years the old tradition served to keep the military bosom bare of millinery, but all the while the weakness for baubles was working its wicked will upon the civil population. Rank by rank, they became Knights Pythias, Odd Fellows, Red Men, Masons, Knights Templar, Elks, Moose, Woodmen—and in every new order there were thirty-two degrees, and for every degree there was a badge, and for every badge there was a yard of ribbon, and for every yard of ribbon there was a bushel of spangles. There is an undertaker in Hagerstown, Md., who belongs to eighteen orders, all knightly, all splendiferous. When he robes himself to plant a fellow joiner he weighs three hundred pounds and sparkles and flashes like the mouth of hell itself. He is entitled to bear seven swords, all jeweled, and to hang his watch chain with the golden busts of nine wild animals, all with rubies for eyes. Put beside this lowly washer of the dead, Pershing newly polished would seem almost like a Trappist. . . .

III.

But even so the civil arm is robbed of its just dues in the department of gauds and radioactivity, no doubt by the direct operation of military vanity and jealousy. Despite a million proofs (and perhaps a billion eloquent arguments) to the contrary, it is still the theory at the official ribbon counter that the only man who serves in a war is the man who serves in uniform. This is soft for the Bevo officer, who at least has his silver stripes and the spurs that gnawed into his desk, but it is hard upon his brother Irving, the dollar-a-year man, who worked twenty hours a day for fourteen months buying soap-powder, canned asparagus and raincoats. Irving not only labored with inconceivable diligence, he also faced hazards of no mean order; for on the one hand was his natural prejudice in favor of a very liberal rewarding of commercial enterprise, and on the other hand was his patriotism and his superstitious fear of Atlanta Penitentiary. I dare say that many and many a time, after working his twenty hours, he found it difficult to sleep the remaining four hours. I know, in fact, survivors of that obscure service who are far worse wrecks today than Pershing is. Their reward is —what? Winks, sniffs, innuendoes. If they would indulge themselves in the now almost universal American yearning to go adorned, they must join the Knights of Pythias or the Rotary Club.

What I propose is a branch of the Distinguished Service Order for civilians—perhaps, better still, a distinct order for civilians, closed to the military and with badges of different colors and areas, to mark off varying services to democracy. Let it run, like the Japanese Paulownia, from high to low —the lowest class for the patriot who sacrificed only time, money and a few nights' sleep; the highest for the great martyr who hung his country's altar with his dignity, his decency and his sacred honor. For Irving and his nervous insomnia, a simple rosette, with an iron badge bearing the national motto, "Safety First"; for the university president who prohibited the teaching of the enemy language in his learned grove, heaved the works of Goethe out of the university library, cashiered every professor unwilling to support Woodrow for the first vacancy in the Trinity, took to the stump for the National Security League, and made two hundred speeches in moving picture theatres—for this giant of loyal endeavor let no 100 per cent American speak of anything less than the grand cross of the order, with a gold badge in polychrome enamel and stained glass, a baldric of the national colors, a violet plug hat with a sunburst on the side, the privilege of the floor of Congress, and a pension of $10,000 a year. After all, the cost would not be excessive; there are not many of them. Such prodigies of patriotism are possible only to rare and gifted men. For the grand cordons of the order, e. g., college professors who spied upon and reported the seditions of their associates, state presidents of the American Protective League, alien property custodians, judges whose sentences of conscientious objectors mounted to more than 50,000 years, members of Dr. Creel's committee of American historians, the authors of the Sisson documents, etc.—pensions of $10 a day would be enough, with silver badges and no plug hats. For the lower ranks, bronze badges and the legal right to the title of "the Hon.", already every true American's by courtesy.

Not, of course, that I am insensitive to the services of the gentlemen of these lower ranks, but in such matters one must go by rarity rather than by intrinsic value. If the grand cordon or even the nickel-plated eagle of the third class were given to every patriot who bored a hole through the floor of his flat to get evidence against his neighbors, the Krausmeyers, and to every one who visited the Hofbräuhaus nightly, denounced the Kai-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ser in scathing terms, and demanded assent from Rudolph and Emil, the waiters, and to every one who notified the Department of Justice when the wireless plant was opened in the Skat-room of the Arion Liedertafel, and to all who took a valiant part in slacker raids, and to all who lent their stenographers funds at 6 per cent to buy 4¼ per cent Liberty bonds, and to all who sold out at 99 and are now buying in at 84.56, and to all who served as jurors or perjurers in cases against Socialists, and to all the Irish who snitched upon the Irish—if decorations were thrown about with any such lavishness, then there would be no nickel left for our bathrooms and battleships. On the civilian side as on the military side the great rewards of war go, not to mere dogged industry and fidelity, but to originality — to the unprecedented, the arresting, the bizarre. The man who invented the story about the German plant for converting the corpses of the slain into soap did more for democracy, and hence deserves a more brilliant recognition, than a thousand uninspired hawkers of ordinary atrocity stories. For him the grand cordon, with two silver badges and the chair of history at Columbia, would be scarcely enough; for them any precious metal would be too much.

Whether or not the Y. M. C. A. has bedizened its heroes I do not know; since the chief Y. M. C. A. lamassary in my native town became the scene of carnalities which engaged the morals police I have ceased to frequent evangelical society. If not, then there should be some governmental recognition of these consecrated and much-maligned patriots. The members of the American Legion, true enough, dislike them, and have a habit of reviling them when the near-beer flows. They charged too much for cigarettes; they turned an unfriendly eye upon the red wine of France and upon the exigent gratitude of the fair; they had a habit of being absent when the shells burst in air and doughboys craved chocolates and spiritual consolation. Well, some say this and some say that. There were at least Y. M. C. A. workers who rose above patriotism to super-patriotism. Eager beyond all telling to seize muskets and help make the world safe for democracy, they throttled their yearning that they might serve the ungrateful and blue-nosed Methodist God. Had it not been for their sacrifice the poor working girl would have worked vaster execution upon the rank and file than even the horrendous Hun—and perhaps upon the officers too, at least upon the youngest and oldest. If, as may be plausibly argued, these soldiers of the soul deserve to live at all, then they surely deserve to wear white enamelled crosses of the third class, with gilt dollar marks superimposed. Motto: "Glory, glory, hallelujah! . . ."

IV.

But what of the vaudeville actors, the cheer leaders, the doughnut fryers, the camp librarians, the press agents? I am not forgetting them. Let them be distributed among all the classes from the seventh to the eighth, according to their deserts. And the agitators against German music? And the specialists in the crimes of the German professors? And the collectors of funds for the Czecho-Slovaks, the Armenians, the Syrians, the Lithuanians, the Poles? And the eagle-eyed scientists who discovered ground glass in pumpernickel, arsenic in dill pickles, bichloride tablets in Bismarck herrings, pathogenic organisms in aniline dyes? And the editorial writers and headline writers? And the authors of books describing how the Kaiser told them the whole plot in 1913, while they were pulling his teeth or cobbling his shoes? And the ex-ambassadors? And the Nietzschefresser? And the Chautauqua lecturers? And the four-minute men? And the reverend clergy? Let no grateful heart forget them!

Palmer and Burleson I leave for special legislation. If mere university presidents are to have the grand cross, then Palmer deserves to be rolled in malleable gold from head to foot, and polished until the very mosquitoes of Washington put on smoked glasses—then Burleson must be hung with diamonds like Mrs. Warren and bathed in spotlights like Gaby Deslys. . . . Finally, I reserve a special decoration to be conferred in camera, and worn only in secret chapter, for husbands who took chances and refused to read anonymous letters from Paris: the sombre badge of the Order de la Cucullus Canorus, first and only class.

H. L. MENCKEN.

The Long Race

Up the old hill to the old house again
Where fifty years ago the friend was young
Who should be waiting somewhere there among
Old things that least remembered most remain,
He toiled on with a pleasure that was pain
To think how soon asunder would be flung
The curtain half a century had hung
Between the two ambitions they had slain.

They dredged an hour for words, and then were done.
"Good-bye! . . . You have the same old weather-vane—
A little horse that's always on the run."
And all the way down back to the next train,
Down the old hill to the old road again,
It seemed as if the little horse had won.

EDWIN ARLINGTON ROBINSON.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British Labor Hesitates

THE labor situation in Great Britain is difficult to estimate—perhaps most difficult of all for those who are nearest to it, and see most of its day-to-day developments. For months past, we have hardly been at any moment without the threat of a serious industrial crisis—and yet the crisis has never come. The storm clouds have gathered again and again—and yet somehow we have never quite expected them to burst. About all the apparent crises there has been a certain air of unreality, a knowledge that the active will to push matters to a decisive issue has not been present. Our crises have been the fourth acts of plays with happy endings, except that our experience does not stop with the end of the play, but shows us all the troubles that the fifth act cleared away returning in full force. In plain terms, our crises have not been real because neither has labor worked itself up to the pitch of forcing a decisive struggle, nor have the government and the employers put their feet down firmly, and refused all concessions. Both sides have compromised, but they have done so only by coming to an agreement on minor points, and leaving the really essential questions unsettled. Consequently, their compromises have not been lasting, and the crises which are periodically settled recur with undiminished frequency.

The explanation of this compromising tendency is not simply, as leader writers maintain, "the rock-bottom common-sense" of the British employer and workingman, but the fact that both parties are anxiously watching the horizon and looking out for good positions in expectation of the storm. The employers have their eye on trade prospects. They have not resisted wage increases commensurate with the rise in the cost of living so far, while the trade boom has held; but already the signs of a break are evident, and a good deal of unemployment is expected. Already, the employers, probably in understanding with the government, are credited with the intention of taking up a united attitude of opposition to further wage advances. It is, in any case, certain that a marked change has come over many of the big groups of employers in their attitude to labor, and that, in at least half a dozen important industries, a deadlock on the wages question has already been reached, so that the unions will have either to withdraw their applications for further advances, or fight on what is beginning to be a falling market.

By far the most important of these deadlocks is, of course, that which has been reached in the coal industry between the government and the Miners' Federation. The miners asked that the enormous surplus profits which are now being made, and largely absorbed by the government through special taxation, in the mining industry should be applied, partly to an increase in wages and partly to a reduction in prices to the domestic consumer. The government, almost certainly acting in close concert with the "big business" representatives who dominate its policy, replied to both demands with a blank refusal. There is, however, no doubt about the miners' determination, in one form or another, to persist with their claim, and therefore very little doubt of the imminence of a really serious mining dispute. If this is allowed to come, and is not staved off by an eleventh hour compromise, it will indicate clearly that the psychological moment has, in the opinion of the capitalist interests, at last arrived, and that it is regarded as high time to do battle on a national scale with the forces of labor.

It will clearly make a great deal of difference whether, in this struggle, the labor movement fights in sections or as a united body, and also, on what ideals and with what program it fights. The Trades Union Congress is at present making an eleventh hour attempt to turn itself into an effective fighting force by means of the "Labor General Staff" scheme recently prepared by a special Trades Union Coordination Committee, of which I was a member; but this scheme cannot possibly be put into operation without some delay, if the British trade union traditions of slow movement are observed; and there is therefore a very serious risk that the trade union movement this autumn will fight, as it has so often fought before, as a series of uncoordinated battalions, instead of as a united force. It is true that unrest in many different industries shows signs of coming to a head but, officially at any rate, there is little chance that the various disputes will mature simultaneously or that the various bodies will be in a position to lend one another effective aid.

There are, however, two factors which may upset this calculation. The first is the possibility that rank and file unrest may, in the autumn, mature to such an extent as to hasten action in many different industries, and that the outbreak of one big dispute may then be the signal for others. This, however, is very doubtful, unless the state of feeling becomes a good deal more inflamed than it yet is. The second, and far more likely, possibility is the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

outbreak of serious industrial troubles having a political origin. The Special Trades Union Congress held in July decided, by a large majority, in favor of the principle of "direct action" on the Irish question; and while the decision was, at the moment, somewhat academic and not intended to lead to immediate action, it is quite possible that events in Ireland will before long turn it into a practical reality, particularly in view of the new measures of coercion which the British government is hurriedly putting into force. A really serious industrial dispute in Ireland, such as might easily arise at any moment from either or both of two causes, could no less easily produce a parallel situation in this country, while a serious entry of the Allies into the Polish-Russian war, especially if it coincided with trouble in Ireland, would almost certainly produce this result. In Ireland the railwaymen, with the backing of the Irish Trades Union Congress, are persisting in their policy of individual refusal to transport troops, armed police, or munitions; and, though they are doing their best to avoid a strike, this policy, long enough continued, seems almost certain to have that result. At the same time, the boycott of Catholic workers by Sir Edward Carson's Belfast following is another factor that may lead to reprisals in England as well as in Ireland, and a boycott of Belfast is being seriously discussed in British labor circles.

There is, then, at least a considerable possibility that, as soon as the slack period of summer draws to a close, industrial and political conditions will alike have reached a point at which a serious conflict will become inevitable; nor is it easy to see where such a conflict can stop, if it once begins. All the same, while all the material factors seem to point in this direction, I hesitate to accept the full implications which seem logically to be involved in them. I hesitate because I cannot feel that the temper of the mass of the British workers is yet by any means as inflamed as the situation would seem to suggest. The great mass, indeed, has hardly realized yet what the situation is, and it is at least to some extent doubtful what their reaction will be when a further development in the situation itself compels them to face its implications. There is, indeed, unrest in plenty; but there is not a clear appreciation of the gravity of the issues involved, or of the magnitude of the struggle that seems to be approaching. I say this, although, in the socialist movement itself, the ferment is already proceeding apace; for the socialists, who provide to a great extent the driving force of British labor, are themselves very sharply divided. The elements of the left, to which some of the guild socialists have rallied, have just formed the British Communist party, whose chance of any considerable success seems mainly to depend on a rapid development of the industrial and political crisis. The Independent Labor party, which still includes the main body of British socialists, is itself sharply divided, and is just engaged in an attempt to redraft its policy and program to fit the new situation. This means that it is, for the moment, to some extent in a state of suspended animation. The National Guilds League, divided into three groups, left, centre and right, is in a somewhat similar condition. The Labor party, powerful as a political instrument, hardly counts as a factor in the forming of socialist or trade union opinion. Thus, no body in the socialist ranks is at present giving a clear constructive lead, and certainly no one is ready to assume, with any positive or constructive program, control of any decisive crisis that may develop. It is an unsatisfactory position, for it points to the coming of a great working-class upheaval producing quite insignificant results. Parturiunt montes: nascetur ridiculus mus.

This may be an unduly pessimistic view, for it is possible that the leaders and the policy will develop in the course of the crisis itself. The main obstacle to their development in advance of the situation is the artificial canalization—as it seems to me—of British labor opinion, under the force of European events, into the two sharply opposed streams of "Bolshevik" and "Parliamentarist" opinion. British Bolshevism is undeniably weak, but I believe that British "constitutional parliamentarism" is in reality hardly less so. There is a great mass of opinion between the two extremes of right and left, between pure constitutionalism and pure revolutionism, and the chance of building an effective movement with a constructive and practicable policy seems to me to depend on the success of this body of opinion in finding, as it has not yet found, some centre around which to rally. The present indications are that, although this may happen in the long run, as I believe it will if the situation allows, it will take some time. It is, therefore, very possible that the situation will develop in advance of it, and the question then will be whether, under the stress of a serious crisis, it will be able to rally quickly and to secure the adoption of its policy. The alternative will probably be no policy at all, save one of drift, and a mere facing of each question as it arises—not, under the existing conditions, at all a hopeful way of dealing with the situation. Given time, the present left and centre of the Independent Labor party and the main body of the guild socialists would form the natural rallying point for such a body of opinion;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but, if these elements fail to develop it, a good many of those who would naturally rally to it will be likely to pass over to the communists.

I am stressing this question of the state of mind of the various sections of British socialism because, although the socialist bodies are very small, they do count for a great deal in the trade union and labor movement. If the opinion of which I have been speaking could succeed in making itself articulate, it could, I believe, easily repeat on a larger scale what the guild socialists have already done so successfully in a narrower sphere. If it could present a constructive political and industrial program, suited to British conditions, and adopting, as integral elements in it, the guild socialist demand for communal ownership and democratic management of industry and a reasonable plan of political reorganization that would cut right away from the traditional parliamentary methods, it would, I believe, find working for it an enormous mass of opinion which will never be attracted by such cries as "the Soviet system" and "the dictatorship of the proletariat." These may have a clear meaning on the continent but they are very difficult to apply clearly to British conditions, and they have, in fact, in British mouths hardly any other meaning than that of "catastrophic revolution." For any direct contemplation of such a step I am quite convinced that the main body of British labor is not at all prepared, although, if a revolutionary situation actually developed, I dare say British workers would actually conduct a revolution as readily as others, and certainly many who would not term themselves advocates of revolution would participate. But to regard revolution as a possibility which may have to be met is one thing; to work deliberately for it is quite another, and a thing for which I see no sign that British labor is eager or prepared. The present situation has all the material possibilities of revolution, if the will were present. But it is not, and the great need is therefore for the development of a policy which, while it is ready to face that possibility, has also a real program of industrial and political action on evolutionary lines. At present, there is no such program, although many of the ingredients for it are ready to hand. Its making is the most important task before the awakened elements in British socialism and trade unionism today.

G. D. H. Cole.

Tammany In Illinois

On Wednesday the official Republicans of Illinois set out to save their state and redeem Chicago. The menace was William Hale Thompson. Reaching out for the first time into state politics, Thompson had lined up a complete ticket in opposition to the regular candidates supported by Governor Lowden. A new Senator from Illinois and an entire state administration were to be nominated in the primaries. The prizes were high. The official Republicans were strongly organized. The Cook County Executive Committee of the National Republican party led the fight. The Committee was supported by various Voters' Leagues and Bar Associations. It was supported by the American Legion. It was supported by the strongest newspapers in Chicago and throughout the state; in Chicago only the unimportant Journal and the two Hearst papers were with the Mayor. And for the regular Republicans, Thompson's adventures during the war seemed to offer a special advantage. There were many voters who did not need to make up their minds as to the character of Thompson's administration or the merit of any of his present issues. The fact was sufficient that in their judgment he had shown himself nothing less than a traitor to his country.

And yet, despite the handicap of Thompson's own reputation and the strength of the organizations opposing him, the primaries resulted in what must certainly be called a Thompson victory. It is not certain, as this is written, whether a Thompson candidate for Senator and a Thompson candidate for Governor will decorate the Republican ticket in November. But Thompson, with a great majority in Cook County, has managed to win enough votes downstate to nominate at least one of his candidates for state office; and if he loses the two top posts of Governor and Senator it will be by margins so small as to leave the official Republicans little assurance for the future.

It is explaining little to say that Thompson's great strength was in Chicago. His candidate for Governor polled almost forty percent of his votes downstate. Nor is it explaining much to say that his strength lies in the fact that his political machine runs smoothly. Spoils of war are not inexhaustible. They take care of the immediate family. But the immediate family still has to go out and secure somehow a majority of the electorate. If the Republican regulars expect to drive Thompson

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from his power they will have to abandon the easy explanation that he wins entirely because of his machine. For the regulars have their own machine. It is a more respectable model. But in its time it has done a fair share of steam-rolling. It was expected, once Thompson left his own bailiwick in the city wards, to steam-roll Thompson. And the explanation is something more than the fact that Thompson is a bold, bad man.

"No Tammany in Illinois" was the issue upon which the regular Republicans chose to meet the Thompson ticket. Tammany, like the Paris apache and the I. W. W., has become a marketable symbol. The regular Republicans lost no chance of using it in Illinois. It was the keynote of their campaign literature. It was the slogan of all anti-Thompson speakers. There were Tammany tigers in the streets of Chicago the week before the primaries, stuffed ones, borne in motor cars by ladies under banners crying "Women! Vote to cage the Tiger."

What did the tiger threaten? Funds, chiefly, to judge from the emphasis of the regular Republicans. There was some stress on vice and crime, and there should have been—for vice and crime are on the increase in Chicago. Thompson's administration was responsible, claimed the Republican regulars; and that charge was reiterated by the Chicago Tribune, which systematically deplores vice on its editorial page and features it in its news. From first to last, however, the chief argument of newspapers and politicians was finances. "Having plundered the city," declared a manifesto of the official Republicans, "the Tammany Tiger seeks more meat." "Never has a city administration been so reckless in its expenditure of money voted by the people for public improvements." Ten million dollars had been needed to run the city in 1915; more than twice that sum in 1920. Regularly, for weeks before the primaries, the Chicago Tribune published documents showing that on city time, at city expense, municipal employees had been put at work in the political headquarters of the Thompson organization. The city's payroll, said the Tribune, boasted many public servants with no public service to perform. So-called experts had on certain occasions been paid as much as $1,000 a day for as many as one hundred days. Fifty thousand dollars of city funds had been divided among one hundred and thirty-one persons for twenty minutes work they never did.

People do not like being robbed. Certainly these charges were given the widest possible publicity. Why did they not cut more of a figure in the voting?

In the first place, probably, because an electorate which feels itself robbed in everything from beefsteak to bootlaces is less likely to be incensed about one additional robbery than an electorate living in days of normal prices or in a nation which controls its profiteering merchants as well as its profiteering politicians. After paying his rent bill, grocer's bill, butcher's bill and drygoods bill, so far as financial matters are concerned the indignation of the ordinary voter is exhausted. Moreover, the Thompson forces succeeded (to a degree doubtless sufficient for many voters) in turning the charge of administration extravagance against the regular Republicans. They unearthed the fact, for instance, that between December and June Governor Lowden had run up a bill of $12,000 at the Hotel Blackstone in Chicago, in expenditures for himself and his immediate aides. Misuse of public funds, declared the Thompson faction, to maintain the Governor's headquarters when he was a candidate for the Presidency. "Official business" was the Governor's explanation. Whatever the business, from a political point of view it was an unhappy errand which took the Governor to the Blackstone for $12,000 worth of lodgings. Finally, official Republican propaganda in the matter of finance overreached itself in particular, and so, for many voters, discredited itself in general. Witness, for instance, the effort of the official Republicans to fix upon William Hale Thompson responsibility for the high cost of living. "If you are a clerk," declared one of the party bulletins, "struggling to make ends meet and have to live in a hall bedroom and wait your turn at the common washroom because you can't afford better lodgings, you are a victim of the spoils system in the City Hall and the extravagance of the Lundin-Thompson political organization." Are there no clerks, struggling to make ends meet and waiting their turn at the common washroom, in other cities under Republican administration? Not all the demagogy was on the side of Thompson. Again, the official Republicans were not satisfied with a spirited assault on the waste and extravagance of Thompson's administration; they went on to the declaration, made it the spearhead of their attack in fact, that "The city is now bankrupt, almost hopelessly so." They put this sensational charge into every official campaign address and into every official campaign leaflet. Thompson replied with statistics, not his own, but a set drawn from the records of the federal government, to show that only one large city in the country (St. Louis) carried a smaller per capita debt than the city of Chicago. The cautious city of Boston, he demonstrated, carried a per capita debt not only larger, but several hundred per cent larger than Chicago's. Moreover, he pointed out that bonds of the city of Chicago were selling six points higher in the open market than what is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

presumably the best security in the world, Victory Bonds of the federal government. If Chicago was bankrupt, what, he wanted to know, had hit the United States of America?

There was a price on victory in the Illinois primaries, and the Republican regulars did not choose to pay it. Making the charges of extravagance and graft the chief issue of the campaign was not enough to bring them a complete victory, even had their charges in no way been discredited. For Thompson's campaign was directed at a more immediate public interest than anything the Republican regulars could bring themselves to deal with. Methodically Thompson set out to win the support of the disgruntled voters. There were plenty of disgruntled voters in Illinois. They objected to higher gas rates and higher telephone rates. They had drawn the conclusion that the Public Utilities Commission was letting the corporations fleece them. They objected to eight-cent fares on the street railway lines. They objected to high rents. They believed profiteering to be largely responsible for the cost of food and clothing. They resented paying federal taxes on diminutive incomes while war profiteers were protected by that secrecy which surrounds the filing of income tax returns. They had many grudges, and Thompson drew his platform to fit in with them. You object to increases in the gas rates? Very well, we'll repeal the State Public Utilities act vesting control of rates in a state commission that can easily be tempted by the barons, and we'll restore control of rates to elected representatives of the people in their home communities. You dislike an eight-cent car fare? All right, we'll have an act enabling the people of Chicago or of any other city to own and operate their street railways, and we'll have a five-cent fare. You object to high rents and prices? Very well, we'll jail the profiteer. You resent being taxed on your own small incomes while possessors of great fortunes are dodging their legitimate share of the burden? All right, we'll exempt from federal taxation incomes of less than $5 a year, and we'll insist upon publicity for ome returns and penalty for evasion. Such w hompson's platform, along with a good deal of atter concerned with American policy in Europe utterly irrelevant to a state election. It was a platform all of whose planks Thompson could not have put into effect even had he captured every office in the state. But it was good reading for many a disgruntled voter. It was a platform for angry men and women.

It did not frighten the regulars. They had both their orthodoxy and their moral superiority to reassure them. Thompson's platform never tempted them to try to meet the same sources of discontent with a program of their own. There was an excellent opportunity for them to follow such a course. We too, they might have said, are alarmed by the housing shortage that is sending rents to unheard-of levels. Houses aren't being built because private capital is turning to building enterprises more profitable. Very well. Thompson proposes nothing more promising than jailing the profiteer. Elect us, and we'll tide you over this period of real crisis with a program of public housing. We agree with you, too, that a good deal of tax-dodging goes on in upper circles. We see no reason why the payment of taxes should continue to be a rite performed in private. We have no control over federal taxes. But to the earnings of both corporation and individual, so far as payment of state taxes is concerned, we propose to give full publicity. We are aware, too, of your dissatisfaction with the increased rates that have been granted traction companies, gas companies and other public utility corporations. Those increases have been based on the principle that costs have risen and that revenue must rise proportionately. But we are aware of the vast fortunes these companies have made in recent years, and at least until present costs of operation are proved permanent we favor proceeding on the principle that the fat years must be averaged in with the lean ones. So far as the general cost of living is concerned, we're as ready as Mr. Thompson is to send the profiteer to prison; but a more effective means of bringing down high prices is the development of cooperative machinery between producer and consumer, working towards the elimination of many of those same interests which have been our own most generous campaign contributors in the past. Such friends we now disown. We pledge our state and county tickets, if elected, to the development of such machinery as their major task in office.

Such a program of counter-attack the official Republicans in Illinois might have followed; but no one expected them to, and they didn't. They gave no indication of perceiving the real grievances of which the Thompson platform was the imperfect and unreliable expression. "This," said Senator Medill McCormick, "is the eternal struggle between right and wrong." But the official Republicans conceived the eternal struggle much too simply. They forgot that they were dealing with a lively resentment, and that the prestige of their own regularity could not entirely offset their failure to interest themselves in what most interested the voting public. They called upon the voters of Illinois to save their state. To save it from Thompson. But to save it for a bankrupt party.

CHARLES MERZ.

Chicago.

CONFINED TO CHICAGO
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Morale

Morale, the Supreme Standard of Life and Conduct, by G. Stanley Hall. New York: D. Appleton and Co.

THE late war enabled a utilitarian age to find at last a practical use for art and philosophy. It found useful employment for artists in camouflage painting, and put philosophers to work finding popular reasons to despise the institutions and achievements of the enemy and to justify the policies of the Allies. Now, whatever may have been the practical value of these praiseworthy efforts of philosophers to help win the war, they do not seem to have produced any books of which philosophy in the future is likely to be proud. At any rate this book of President Hall, though it has a distinctly philosophic sub-title, can most fairly be classified as a slightly belated war book, with some chapters on labor, feminism, the League of Nations and the red peril, to fit the present hour.

As *morale* has recently become one of the fashionable words, a philosophic or psychologic analysis of what, if anything, it denotes, would have been a great boon. But President Hall is too eager to get down to practical details of games, songs, and lists of slogans for soldiers to waste much time on definitions and proof. Declaring that morale is "not entirely definable" (p. 10), he finds it sufficient to tell us that it consists in the "cult of condition," "being in tip-top condition." Here an old-fashioned philosopher might object that, except as to bodily health, this is dreadfully vague, and that being fit cannot be the supreme rule of life, because we must first decide what things we ought to be fit for. But these objections may be dismissed as scholastic. By disregarding the few passages which explicitly deal with philosophic themes, the critical reader can find implicit in this volume two distinct philosophies whose incomplete fusion is the cause of the muddled condition of contemporary popular thought.

On one hand we have the old American laissez-faire individualism, and on the other is the philosophy of the supremacy of the state or national will which war conditions imposed on us, in spite of the fact that it comes from Hegel, Treitschke, Bernhardi, et al. It certainly requires no stretch of the imagination to suppose that it is an officer of the German general staff who is urging that the influence of the army morale officers should extend to the civilian body (p. 176), that the War Department should take up such work vigorously, and that "there should be much confidential literature, and yet the general press should be furnished with everything that soldiers and civilians ought to know" [in the judgment of the Department]. Somewhat more Jesuitical is the advice to take a leaf out of the Mormon's book and send out young men contaminated with radical leanings as missionaries to make propaganda for orthodox conservatism (p. 241). But this enthusiasm for military morale, and the aggressive affirmation that the point of view of morale is superior to that of conscience, is all spoiled by outcroppings of the traditional American liberalism which causes President Hall to withdraw in one part of the book what he confidently asserts in the other. Thus, in line with the new dispensation, internationalism is characterized as a sin and a curse, but in line with the Americanism of James Russell Lowell and others, love of mankind is regarded as higher than patriotism; indeed, one who loves his country more than mankind will very strongly tend to love party more than country and his class interests more than those of the community (p. 313). Thus also it is asserted that the war has made us respect the military system (p. 29), and that the ideal soldier is the ideal man par excellence; and yet it is admitted that moral corruption, greed, profiteering and crass superstition a la Oliver Lodge, follow every war (pp. 147, 230). "War makes men a little more careless, more or less disenchanted with woman and life" (p. 114). As the point of view of morale is superior to that of conscience, the conscientious objectors are naturally wretches, masochists, etc., in possession of a "suspicious amount of money." But after all there is the old fugitive slave law, and Dr. Hall as a good Northerner is compelled to admit that sometimes people are right in following their conscience and refusing to obey the law. The interests of morale demand keeping spies in Germany (p. 125), but the traditional American aversion to spying crops up a few pages later.

In the smaller portion of the book devoted more directly to civilian affairs, the safe, sane and conservative views of the generation of McKinley, Hanna and Harding remain relatively unaffected by the new militaristic philosophy or by anything else of recent occurrence. Labor is entitled to an adequate food supply, to the privilege of marriage and family life, recreation, and even intellectual development, but if it tries to profiteer(!) millions of Asiatic toilers will be imported. The whole question of democracy in the government of industry is beyond the author's complacent horizon. In the chapter on prohibition we learn the startling psychologic fact that strike meetings are a substitute for the conviviality of the saloon (p. 224). As a representative of the older generation President Hall does not wax enthusiastic about the lady voter. He still believes that the best woman is the one who has the most children (p. 248). But in his views on religion he gives expression to sentiments to which Senator Harding would certainly not subscribe: "Religion, which is one of the world's chief agents for sublimating sex, has always tended more or less, not only in ancient orgies but also in the history of great revivals, to lapse into grossness" (pp. 264-5). "No human institution is so conservative of things outgrown as is religion" (p. 346). There are also brave words to the effect that belief in an objective personal deity is no more necessary than belief in an objective personal devil, and that faith in another world has been moribund since the decay of the belief in an actual hell. In the end, however, President Hall's religious radicalism, like that of a great many academic radicals, is mainly verbal. It consists in a "restatement of the essential old dogmas;" and to the eyes of the unregenerate there are no obvious advantages in this process of putting new labels on the old tin cans of dogma. Of what advantage is it to substitute "developmental urge" for God, "the subconscious" for the soul, and "natural selection" for divine providence, if the former function the same as the latter, punish the sinner, etc.? A generation ago the people who used the newer terms had a comforting belief that their dogmas were not only superior in point of being the latest, but also that they were proved by scientific biology —just as the older generation of theologians had an undisturbed belief in the superiority of Christianity because it was a religion based on evidence. But the newer generation of scientists has little use for the evolutionary dogmas to which President Hall clings. They flatly reject

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sexual selection (which figures prominently in his chapter on Feminism), are sceptical about the inheritance of acquired characteristics, and bring no support whatever to the belief in a universal "upward and onward." Did not Huxley himself show how empty of ethical meaning is the phrase "survival of the fittest"? If we are to accept President Hall's scorn for "the philanthropy and the medical arts that keep the unfit alive," why not keep the terms of the older theologians? They at least had definite views as to who are the unfit or sinners.

President Hall has a deservedly high reputation as a scientific psychologist, and some of the psychologic explanations in this volume are undoubtedly ingenious. But as to the reality of the facts he explains it is not so easy to be certain. In view of what has been going on in India and Ireland as well as in Eastern Europe, one can doubt whether frightfulness in war has really received its coup de grace. Also, in discussing a question like the relative effectiveness of prophylaxsis and moral suasion as means of reducing the ravages of venereal disease, it might be better to refer to the available statistics. But considerations of fact are, after all, not primary in the author's regard. He believes that facts "cannot and must not" change certain treasured beliefs (p. 367).

Unlike some other of President Hall's books, this one is written almost entirely in English. The words vicariate, nisus, adjuvant, erethic, calentures, projiccient, apocatastosis, henotheistically, etc., occur infrequently. Perhaps they are given just a little airing and exercise to prevent them becoming atrophied from disuse. It would be unfair to imply that there are not many notable passages in the book. A really noble one is that about death being the tabula rasa, and the holocausts of war intensifying the consciousness of nescience (p. 53). But the two passages that best characterize the book as a whole are

> "gassing, too, is bad on morale" (p. 27),

and

> "nothing is more offensive to a healthy soul than to read or hear the platitudes spun to such tedious lengths" (p. 108).

PHILONOUS.

Thirty Years Ago

The Cleveland Era. A Chronicle of the New Order in Politics, by Henry Jones Ford. [*The Chronicles of America, Volume 44.*] *New Haven: Yale University Press.*

THIS is not a eulogy of Grover Cleveland; it is not a biography of him, although a fresh brief account of his life is included. But never before in such brief compass, and only once or twice in five times the space, has so satisfactory a picture been given of the part played by this sturdy American in the political life of the nation. And in no previous account has this particular view of Cleveland been presented.

In the course of the past fifty years three Presidents have captured the popular imagination and held it in such a way as to make competition useless for a time. Except for these three, no American citizen has ever entirely filled the public eye for even a brief period. During the period of their ascendency each of these men has attempted to lead the nation into unaccustomed paths and each has lost control of his political party by so doing. Of the three Cleveland seemed to make the most signal failure. Perhaps it was in a measure because he was a forerunner for Roosevelt and Wilson. But in this account by Mr. Henry Jones Ford we find a deeper reason.

It is this. Cleveland rose to prominence as a conscientious public official, in Buffalo and in Albany doing his duty. Now this more frequently than not consisted in restraining men from performing illegal or unjust acts; in pointing out things that ought not to be done. So, too, in the Presidency, Cleveland opposed the pension graft, gallantly and within limits effectively; opposed senatorial dictation of appointments stubbornly, and in the case of the appointment of Chief Justice White with facile irony; opposed the free silver movement to the point of risking national bankruptcy and finally achieving the absolute ruin of the political party of which he was the leader. In these matters Cleveland unquestionably chose the part of wisdom. They mark the man utterly immune from party virus or love of mere personal triumph. But by themselves they do not mark the statesman. Definite proposals to meet the needs of the country in the way of an elastic currency, the needs of the farmers for more extended credit, the needs of the laborer for a less number of working hours; these are not found. True, there was the Cleveland advocacy of a low tariff; upon that it is assumed he pointed the way. But did he? As we view it now it seems rather that here again it was primarily an opposition of his to Republican tariffs and their way of making them, rather than a clear view of a new land that he had visioned. As he himself said in his memorable message it was a condition not a theory that he was dealing with; and the Wilson bill that had his approval was, as Taussig has pointed out, a moderate protective tariff.

One is puzzled at the sub-title after reading the book. "The new order in politics" appears in this narrative of the years 1885-1897 to consist of the struggle of Cleveland against a system that bore all others to the wall and him, too, at the end; if so, the new order consisted of an emphatic protest. This is hardly the place given to Cleveland by those who have previously written of this period, but the difference is, I think, one of emphasis or perhaps of the author's interest. Mr. Ford does not see these years crowded with personalities and Cleveland as the protagonist of Good against Evil. He has conceived of the government of the United States as a great machine working cumbersomely and now and then having grave difficulty because of breaks in the mechanism. He pictures the various public figures of the period at the task of directing, repairing, cleaning this great machine. He finds some negligent, many ignorant, a few grossly in error in judgment. In his sketch of the evils of later reconstruction it is the system, not any individual, that is held up to public condemnation. But taking such a view of government in the period covered by this book he has given a novel view of some of the actors and has arrived in several cases at a more truthful conclusion than have some of his predecessors in their narratives of these years. Quite naturally he gives emphasis to the work of Thomas B. Reed who found a way to run the machine more effectively in 1890. It is surprising that in a book covering this period a portrait of McKinley appears but no portrait of Reed.

Writing less with moral indignation than with the sorrow of a scientist Mr. Ford wastes few words in harsh denunciation. He does speak of "the notorious demagogue, General Butler," and of "the gentle cynic, Matthew Quay." He is more severe in his treatment of Benjamin Harrison. He points out that Grant and Hayes stood out against

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the greenback movement; and he states that Grant was favorable to civil service reform. And when Conkling, Bryan, Debs, and Altgeld march across these pages it is in their proper clothing, that is in their own professions and not in the opinions of their opponents. This results in an unusual account of Conkling's quarrel with Garfield. Throughout, having sketched the political scene and pointed out the needs of the country, the author lets each figure reveal to the reader his method and his remedy. This, for example, gives new and juster place to Senator Edmunds. Altogether it makes for a fresh account of a period not so far away and during it many a labor strike was called, many an anarchist bomb exploded, to warn us of what we are now experiencing. Popular movements are less in evidence than are striking episodes, such as the Morey letter, the Sackville-West indiscretion, and Blaine's speech at the close of the campaign of 1884. Four lines are given to the Populist party, and Cleveland, not the radicals, is given the credit for making the issue clear cut in 1896. While I think this mistaken emphasis, this definite and studied subordination of contemporaneous passion may have good results in influencing subsequent writers.

In large measure the author lets Cleveland tell his story in the same way; but there are passages of summary that reveal the author's grasp.

> But Cleveland was not a genius; he was not even a man of marked talent. He was staunch, plodding, laborious, and dutiful, but he was lacking in ability to penetrate to the heart of obscure political problems and to deal with primary causes rather than with effects.
>
> The invincible determination which President Cleveland showed in this memorable struggle to maintain the gold standard will always remain his surest title to renown. But the admiration due to his constancy of soul can not be extended to his handling of the financial problem.
>
> In his inaugural address he indicated in a general way the policy pursued throughout his term when he said, 'I shall to the best of my ability and within my sphere of duty preserve the Constitution by loyally protecting every grant of Federal power it contains, by defending all its restraints when attacked by impatience and restlessness, and by enforcing its limitations and reservations in favor of the states and their people.' This statement sets forth a low view of governmental function and practically limits its sphere to the office of the policeman whose chief concern is to suppress disorder. Statesmanship should go deeper and should labor in a constructive way to remove cause of disorder.

The book closes with this sentence: "Party experience during the Cleveland era contains many lessons but none clearer than that Presidential leadership is essential both to legislative achievement and to party success." It is difficult to understand this. Certainly Cleveland furnished Presidential leadership; but the record in legislation was barren and the party entered upon a long period of exile. Here again the only conclusion seems to be that such activity as Cleveland was capable of—energetic, untiring, and splendid, serving as a moral tonic to the nation—was nevertheless not Presidential leadership as Mr. Ford conceives of it. Did not Cleveland fail precisely because he did not act as a party leader?

The Cleveland era appears in these two hundred and twenty pages to have been the Awakening Era, and the new order in politics appears to have been the enforcement of law. But nevertheless it is neither the awakening caused by Cleveland nor his willingness to restrain men that makes this short essay of greatest interest at the present moment. It is rather because we see that thirty years ago, as now, the problems of leadership arising out of man's attempt to govern himself are not to be met within the narrow confines of law. That is merely postponing the evil day. In revealing this anew in this short essay of a brief period of our national history, Mr. Ford has done a real service to those interested in public affairs.

E. A. R.

Deliverance, by E. L. Grant Watson. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

IN the preface of Deliverance, Mr. Grant Watson writes that he has "tried to portray a process of spiritual emancipation" in the development of Susan Zalesky. Doubtless he has tried to portray such a process, perhaps he has done so, but just what Susan Zalesky emancipates into is a little difficult to conceive, and sounds, on the whole, much less interesting than the rather fascinating story of her procedure. If she emancipates—and doubtless she does, for Mr. Watson is neither an unintelligent nor an untrained writer—so does every one else in the story. Certainly the process her father goes through is the best part of the book, and his emancipation is more human than hers.

Judged more freely, however, Deliverance is interesting and delightful for other qualities than its processes. It comes in many ways as near the art of the Russian novelists as any English novel. It has much of the particular and keen subjective analysis of The Cherry Orchard or The Idiot, it has something of the objective speculation and universal philosophy of A Night's Lodging or Anna Karenina, and it approaches—though not so successfully—the vivid, tense conversational narrative power of The Country Doctor. In the very matter of spiritual emancipation the novel is, perhaps, weakest. The Russian conception of character will not fit the English mind, and Susan and Dorothy and Tom and Noel show traces of the wooden puppets that Galsworthy, Pinero, and Wells have painted first black and then white in their clumsy mechanical efforts to make their characters develop. Paul Zalesky alone approaches the Russian character—a conception in which the human being does not change his spots over night, but is a continuum of many desires, emotions, and tendencies which may shift their emphasis in the complex but never deny themselves.

The tale is set in rural England, changing later to artistic London, and throughout the book Mr. Watson combines the elements of his writing well. Description reminiscent of James Stephens is placed near the terminology of a technical psychological analysis, but the writing is done so well that nearly all trace of derivation or mechanical structure disappears. The book is well written, with something more than facility turned to account in the procedure of a careful analysis.

R. V. A. S.

Contributors

ROBERT W. BRUERE is one of the arbitrators under the Protocol in the skirt and waist industry, and is engaged in promoting publicity for better standards of labor.

H. L. MENCKEN, critic and journalist, is the author of A Book of Prefaces and Forty-nine Little Essays.

G. D. H. COLE, Secretary of the Advisory Committees of the British Labor party, is the author of An Introduction to Trade Unionism and Labor in the Commonwealth.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED